

REMARKS

In response to the above-noted Office Action, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6 and 8.

No claims have been cancelled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-11 are objected to because of informalities as indicated at page 2 of the Action. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6 and 8 to overcome the claim objections as recommended by the Examiner. Approval is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over *Ho et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,934,280), as indicated on pages 3-7 of the Action. In response, Applicant has reviewed the cited reference, *Ho et al.*, and has amended claim 1 by adding “after determining that received packet data is from disassembled data segments” after “assembling the disassembled data segments.” In the Action, the Examiner indicates that the disassembling of packet data into data segments of a predetermined size and assembling the disassembled data segment into the original packet data structure is disclosed at column 5, lines 8-20 and assembling the disassembled data structure into the original data package structure, if the MTU of the external network interface is greater than the MTU of an internal data communication channel in the router is disclosed at column 5, lines 65-67 and column 6, lines 1-5 and Figure 4, reorder buffer 410. The amendment to Claim 1 adds the limitation that the disassembled data segments are assembled “if after determining that received packet data is from disassembled data segments.” *Ho et al.* does not appear to teach this limitation at the specified portion of the reference, or elsewhere. Further, it is noted that in the Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claim 6 contains allowable subject matter by virtue of elements (e), (d) and (f) in Claim 6. Although the foregoing amendment does not include all of the (e), (d) and (f) limitations of Claim 6, the amendment to Claim 1 introduces sufficient

portions of the allowable subject matter so as to be distinguishable over the prior art of record since Ho et al. does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Claims 6-11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the informalities as noted by the Examiner, see pages 7-8 where reasons for allowability are also given. In response, Applicant has amended claims 6 and 8 as recommended by the Examiner. Approval is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending for examination, namely Claims 1-11 now clearly show and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Therefore, Applicant believes that all pending claims are now patentable over the cited references issued by the Examiner.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN

Dated: 7/26/07

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

Eric S. Hyman Reg. No. 30,139

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class Mail, With Sufficient Postage, In An Envelope Addressed To: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Linda Marie Metz 7-27-07
Linda Marie Metz July 27, 2007